arXiv:1201.6104v2 [math.GR] 22 May 2012

Blowing up and down compacta with geometrically finite convergence actions of a group

Yoshifumi Matsuda*[†], Shin-ichi Oguni[‡], Saeko Yamagata[§]

Abstract

We consider two compacta with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of a countable group. When there exists an equivariant continuous map from one to the other, we call the first a blow-up of the second and the second a blow-down of the first. The following are shown: when both actions are geometrically finite, one is a blow-up of the other if and only if each parabolic subgroup with respect to the first is parabolic with respect to the second; any family of compacta with geometrically finite convergence actions of a finitely generated group has the smallest common blow-up, on which the action is geometrically finite if the family is finite. Also we construct two families of uncountably infinitely many blow-downs of a given compactum with a geometrically finite convergence action of a countable group.

Keywords: geometrically finite convergence actions; relatively hyperbolic groups; convergence actions; augmented spaces

2010MSC: 20F67; 20F65

1 Introduction

The notion of geometrically finite convergence groups is a generalized notion of geometrically finite Kleinian groups and is deeply related to the notion of relatively hyperbolic groups (see [5, Definition 1] and [29, Theorem 0.1]). The study of convergence groups was initiated in [12]. Also relatively hyperbolic groups have been studied since they were introduced in [16] (see for example [5], [8], [9] and [24]). In this paper we study blow-ups and blow-downs of compact

---

*Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 153-8914 Japan, ymatsuda@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

[†] The author is supported by the Global COE Program at Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, the University of Tokyo, and Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Researches for Young Scientists (B) (No. 22740034), Japan Society of Promotion of Science.

[‡] Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Ehime University, 2-5 Bunkyo-cho, Matsuyama, Ehime, 790-8577 Japan, oguni@math.sci.ehime-u.ac.jp

[§] Faculty of Education and Human Sciences, Yokohama National University, 240-8501 Yokohama, Japan, yamagata@ynu.ac.jp

metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions of a group by using relative hyperbolicity of the group. We note that the actions on such blow-ups and blow-downs are not necessarily geometrically finite.

Let G be a countable group, which has compact metrizable spaces X and Y endowed with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G. We denote the set of maximal parabolic subgroups with respect to X by $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ and call $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ the peripheral structure of X. When the action on X is geometrically finite, $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ is called a proper relatively hyperbolic structure on G ([20, Definition 2.1]). If X and Y are G-equivariant homeomorphic, then we have $\mathfrak{H}(X) = \mathfrak{H}(Y)$. Also if we have a G-equivariant continuous map from X to Y, then we have $\mathfrak{H}(X) \to \mathfrak{H}(Y)$ (Lemma 2.3(5)). Here $\mathfrak{H}(X) \to \mathfrak{H}(Y)$ means that each maximal parabolic subgroup with respect to X is a parabolic subgroup with respect to Y (see also the sentence just before Lemma 2.2). When there exists a G-equivariant continuous map from X to Y, we call X a blow-up of Y and Y a blow-down of X.

Suppose that the actions on X and Y are geometrically finite. If $\mathfrak{H}(X) = \mathfrak{H}(Y)$, then X and Y are G-equivariant homeomorphic (see [29, Theorem 0.1] and also [18, Theorem 5.2]). When we consider $\mathfrak{H}(X) \to \mathfrak{H}(Y)$ instead of $\mathfrak{H}(X) = \mathfrak{H}(Y)$, we have the following (compare with the second question in [23, Introduction]):

Theorem 1.1. *Let G be a countable group and X and Y be compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions of G. If $\mathfrak{H}(X) \to \mathfrak{H}(Y)$, then we have a G-equivariant continuous map $\pi : X \to Y$.*

For the case where both actions are geometrically finite Kleinian group actions which may be higher dimensional, Theorem 1.1 is known by [26, Corollary of Theorem 1]. The argument is based on existence of the so-called Floyd maps by [10] and [26, Theorem 1]. Our approach to Theorem 1.1 is different from them. Indeed we do not use either Floyd boundaries nor Floyd maps to prove Theorem 1.1.

Remark 1.2. For the case where G is finitely generated, it is possible to give a simpler alternative proof of Theorem 1.1 under existence of Floyd maps which is claimed in [14, Corollary in Section 1.5]. Indeed existence of Floyd maps and [15, Theorem A] (or Lemma 2.3 (4)) imply Theorem 1.1 for the case where G is finitely generated. We note that any geometrically finite Kleinian group is finitely generated, but a countable group admitting a geometrically finite convergence action is not necessarily finitely generated.

Remark 1.3. We consider $\pi : X \to Y$ in Theorem 1.1. General properties of equivariant continuous maps between minimal non-elementary convergence actions imply the following (see Lemma 2.3):

- π is surjective;
- π is a unique G-equivariant continuous map from X to Y;

- if $q \in Y$ is a bounded parabolic point and H is its maximal parabolic subgroup, then $\pi^{-1}(q)$ is equal to the limit set $\Lambda(H, X)$ of the induced action of H on X;
- $id_G \cup \pi : G \cup X \to G \cup Y$ is continuous.

Here $G \cup X$ and $G \cup Y$ are natural compactifications of G by X and Y (see [13, Subsection 2.4] and Lemma 2.1).

We consider blow-downs of a compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G. In fact we construct two families of uncountably infinitely many compact metrizable spaces endowed with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G which are not geometrically finite as blow-downs. The first family consists of uncountably infinitely many blow-downs with the same peripheral structure:

Theorem 1.4. Let G be a countable group and let X be a compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G. Then there exists a family $\{X_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}}$ of compact metrizable spaces endowed with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G which satisfies the following:

(1) for every $\lambda \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $\mathfrak{H}(X) = \mathfrak{H}(X_\lambda)$;

(2) for every $\lambda \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, X_λ is a blow-down of X;

(3) for any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, X_λ is a blow-down of $X_{\lambda'}$ if and only if $\lambda^{-1}(\{1\}) \supset \lambda'^{-1}(\{1\})$;

(4) for any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lambda \neq \lambda'$, X_λ is not G-equivariant homeomorphic to $X_{\lambda'}$;

(5) for every $\lambda \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, the action of G on X_λ is not geometrically finite,

where $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is the set of all functions from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\{0,1\}$.

The second family consists of uncountably infinitely many blow-downs with mutually different peripheral structures:

Theorem 1.5. Let G be a countable group and let X be a compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G. Then there exists a family $\{Y_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}}$ of compact metrizable spaces endowed with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G which satisfies the following:

(1) for every $\lambda \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $\mathfrak{H}(X) \neq \mathfrak{H}(Y_\lambda)$;

(2) for every $\lambda \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, Y_λ is a blow-down of X;

(3) for any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, the following are equivalent:
    - Y_λ is a blow-down of $Y_{\lambda'}$;
    - $\mathfrak{H}(Y_\lambda) \supset \mathfrak{H}(Y_{\lambda'})$;

- $\lambda^{-1}(\{1\}) \supset \lambda'^{-1}(\{1\})$;

(4) for any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lambda \neq \lambda'$, $\mathfrak{H}(Y_\lambda)$ is not equal to $\mathfrak{H}(Y_{\lambda'})$. In particular, Y_λ is not G-equivariant homeomorphic to $Y_{\lambda'}$;

(5) for every $\lambda \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, the action of G on Y_λ is not geometrically finite. In particular, $\mathfrak{H}(Y_\lambda)$ contains infinitely many conjugacy classes if $\lambda^{-1}(\{1\})$ is infinite.

On the other hand we have the following (compare with Theorem 1.4):

Proposition 1.6. Let G be a countable group. Let X be a compact metrizable space endowed with a minimal non-elementary convergence action of G and Y be a compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G. Let $\pi : X \to Y$ be a G-equivariant continuous map. If $\mathfrak{H}(X) = \mathfrak{H}(Y)$, then π is a G-equivariant homeomorphism.

Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a family of compact metrizable spaces endowed with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G, where I is a non-empty countable index set. We consider the diagonal map $\Delta : G \to \prod_{i\in I}(G \cup X_i)$ and the closure $\overline{\Delta(G)}$ of $\Delta(G)$ in $\prod_{i\in I}(G \cup X_i)$. We denote $\overline{\Delta(G)} \setminus \Delta(G)$ by $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$. If the induced action of G on $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is a convergence action, then $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is the smallest common blow-up of all X_i, that is, $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is a common blow-up of all X_i and any common blow-up of all X_i is a blow-up of $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ (see Lemma 2.6). Unfortunately we do not know whether the action of G on $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is a convergence action or not when I has at least two elements (see [13, Subsection 2.4]). We have an affirmative answer if the action of G on X_i is geometrically finite for every $i \in I$ and G is finitely generated. In fact we have the following:

Theorem 1.7. Let G be a finitely generated group. Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a family of compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions of G, where I is a non-empty countable index set. Then the action of G on $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is a minimal non-elementary convergence action of G such that $\mathfrak{H}(\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i) = \bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$. Here a subgroup of G belongs to $\bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$ if and only if it is infinite and is an intersection of some $H_i \in \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$ for each $i \in I$.

Moreover if I is finite, then the action of G on $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is geometrically finite.

Remark 1.8. If I is infinite, then the convergence action of G on $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is not necessarily geometrically finite (see Remark 1.13 and also Proof of Theorem 1.4).

Remark 1.9. When G is finitely generated, there exist at most countably infinitely many proper relatively hyperbolic structures on G (see [20, Proposition 6.4]). Hence there exist at most countably infinitely many G-equivariant homeomorphism classes of geometrically finite convergence actions of G. Thus countability of I is not an essential assumption. Also if a countable group G admits a geometrically finite convergence action on a compact metrizable space, G has infinitely many geometrically finite convergence actions on compact metrizable spaces (see for example [20, Theorem 6.3]).

On the other hand the following claims that there exists a family of compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions which admits no common blow-downs:

Proposition 1.10. Let G be a countable group and X_0 be a compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G. Then we have a sequence of compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions $\{X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a sequence of G-equivariant continuous surjections $\{\pi_n : X_{n-1} \to X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\varinjlim_{n\in\mathbb{N}} X_n$ is not Hausdorff and there do not exist any common blow-downs of all X_n.

Let X be a compact metrizable space endowed with a non-elementary convergence action of a countable group G. The action on X is called the universal convergence action if every compact metrizable space endowed with a non-elementary convergence action of G is a blow-down of X ([13, Subsection 2.4]). Unfortunately we do not know any groups with the universal convergence actions. We note that a compact metrizable space endowed with the universal convergence action has no proper blow-ups. The following gives a sufficient condition that a compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action has no proper blow-ups:

Proposition 1.11. Let G be a countable group. Let X be a compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G. If every $H \in \mathfrak{H}(X)$ is not virtually cyclic and has no non-elementary convergence actions, then X has no proper blow-ups.

If G is a non-elementary hyperbolic group, then the action on the ideal boundary ∂G is a geometrically finite convergence action with no parabolic points (see [16, 8.2] and also [11, Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.7]). Then there exist no proper blow-ups of ∂G ([13, Subsection 2.5]). We recognize other examples by Proposition 1.11. Indeed the limit set of any geometrically finite Kleinian group such that the set of maximal parabolic subgroups does not contain virtually cyclic subgroups has no proper blow-ups because maximal parabolic subgroups are virtually abelian (refer to [27, Theorem 2U]). Also if a group G is a free product of finitely many groups which are either $\mathbb{Z}^k$ $(k \geq 2)$, $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ $(n \geq 3)$ or the mapping class group of an orientable surface of genus g with p punctures, where $3g + p \geq 5$, then the set of all conjugates of factors of G is a peripheral structure of a compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action which has no proper blow-ups (see Appendix A and refer to [20, Remark (II) in Section 7]).

We call a convergence action of G on a compact metrizable space X the universal geometrically finite convergence action if the action on X is geometrically finite and every compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G is a blow-down of X. When G is finitely generated and has a geometrically finite convergence action, we obtain the smallest common blow-up of all compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions by applying Theorem 1.7 to a family of representatives of G-equivariant homeomorphism classes of all compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions. However the action is not necessarily geometrically finite (see Remark 1.13). On the other hand we recognize many examples of groups with the universal geometrically finite convergence actions. Indeed when a convergence action of G on X is geometrically finite, it is the universal geometrically finite convergence action if and only if $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ is the universal relatively hyperbolic structure on G in the sense of [20, Definition 4.1] by Theorem 1.1 (see also Lemma 2.3 (5)) and we know many examples of groups with the universal relatively hyperbolic structures (see [20, Remark (II) in Section 7]). The following is equivalent to an open question (see [3, Question 1.5] and also [20, Remark (IV) in Section 7]):

Question 1.12. Does every finitely presented group with a geometrically finite convergence action have the universal geometrically finite convergence action? Does every torsion-free finitely generated group with a geometrically finite convergence action have the universal geometrically finite convergence action?

Remark 1.13. We consider the smallest common blow-up of all compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions of the so-called Dunwoody's inaccessible group J. It follows from [3, Section 6] that J does not have the universal relatively hyperbolic structure (see also [20, Remark (IV) in Section 7]). In particular the action is not geometrically finite. We note that J is finitely generated but neither finitely presented nor torsion-free.

In Section 2, we gather and show some properties of convergence actions. Also Propositions 1.6 and 1.11 are proved. In Section 3, we recall some terminologies about augmented spaces in [17]. In Section 4, Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.10 are proved. Also a corollary of Theorem 1.1 for semiconjugacies is shown (Corollary 4.4). In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5. In Section 6, Theorem 1.7 is proved. In Appendix A, a criterion for countable groups to have no non-elementary convergence actions is shown. In Appendix B, we give a remark on hyperbolically embedded virtually free subgroups of relatively hyperbolic groups.

2 Convergence actions and peripheral structures

In this section, we recall some definitions related to convergence actions and geometrically finite convergence actions of groups (refer to [27], [28], [5] and [4]) and show some properties.

Let G be a countable group with a continuous action on a compact metrizable space X. The action is called a convergence action of G on X if X has infinitely many points and for each infinite sequence $\{g_i\}$ of mutually different elements of G, there exist a subsequence $\{g_{i_j}\}$ of $\{g_i\}$ and two points $r, a \in X$ such that $g_{i_j}|_{X\setminus\{r\}}$ converges to a uniformly on any compact subset of $X \setminus \{r\}$ and also $g_{i_j}^{-1}|_{X\setminus\{a\}}$ converges to r uniformly on any compact subset of $X \setminus \{a\}$. The sequence $\{g_{i_j}\}$ is called a convergence sequence and also the points r and a are called the repelling point of $\{g_{i_j}\}$ and the attracting point of $\{g_{i_j}\}$, respectively.

We fix a convergence action of G on a compact metrizable space X. The set of all repelling points and attracting points is equal to the limit set $\Lambda(G, X)$ ([27, Lemma 2M]). The cardinality of $\Lambda(G, X)$ is 0, 1, 2 or ∞ ([27, Theorem 2S, Theorem 2T]). If $\#\Lambda(G, X) = \infty$, then the action of G on X is called a non-elementary convergence action. When the action of G on X is a non-elementary convergence action, G is infinite and the induced action of G on $\Lambda(G, X)$ is a minimal non-elementary convergence action. We remark that $\#\Lambda(G, X) = 0$ if G is finite by definition. Also G is virtually infinite cyclic if $\#\Lambda(G, X) = 2$ (see [27, Lemma 2Q, Lemma 2N and Theorem 2I]). An element l of G is loxodromic if it is of infinite order and has exactly two fixed points. For a loxodromic element $l \in G$, the sequence $\{l^i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a convergence sequence with the repelling point r and the attracting point a, which are distinct and fixed by l. We call a subgroup H of G a parabolic subgroup if it is infinite, fixes exactly one point and has no loxodromic elements. Such a point is called a parabolic point. A parabolic point is bounded if its maximal parabolic subgroup acts cocompactly on its complement. We call a point r of X a conical limit point if there exists a convergence sequence $\{g_i\}$ with the attracting point $a \in X$ such that the sequence $\{g_i(r)\}$ converges to a different point from a. A convergence action of G on X is geometrically finite if every point of X is either a conical limit point or a bounded parabolic point. Since X has infinitely many points, every geometrically finite convergence action is non-elementary. Also since all conical limit points and all bounded parabolic points belong to the limit set, every geometrically finite convergence action is minimal.

The following claims that a compact metrizable space X endowed with a minimal non-elementary convergence action of a countable group G naturally gives a compactification of G (refer to [13, Subsection 2.4]):

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be a countable group and X be a compact metrizable space endowed with a minimal non-elementary convergence action of G. Then X gives a unique compactification of G such that the natural action of G on $G \cup X$ is a convergence action whose limit set is X.*

Proof. The space X gives a compactification of $\Theta_3(X) := \{\{p, q, r\} \mid p, q, r \in X, p \neq q, q \neq r, r \neq p\}$ (see [4, p.4]), which we denote by $\Theta_3(X) \cup X$. We take $o \in \Theta_3(X)$. Since the action of G on $\Theta_3(X)$ is proper, $f_o : G \ni g \to go \in \Theta_3(X)$ is proper. Hence the union $G \cup_o X$ of G and X with a topology induced by this map is compact. We prove that X gives a compactification of G, that is, G is dense in $G \cup_o X$. Since G is infinite and f_o is proper, we have a point p of X that is an accumulation point of the orbit Go. Since the action of G on X is minimal, every point of X is an accumulation point of Go. Then G is dense in $G \cup_o X$. Since the natural action of G on $\Theta_3(X) \cup X$ is a convergence action whose limit set is X (refer to [4, p.8]), the induced action of G on $G \cup_o X$ is a convergence action whose limit set is X.

We assume that for each $k = 1, 2$, $G \cup_k X$ is a compactification of G by X and the natural action of G on $G \cup_k X$ is a convergence action whose limit set is X. We prove that the map from $G \cup_1 X$ to $G \cup_2 X$ induced by $id_G : G \to G$ and $id_X : X \to X$ is continuous. We take a sequence $\{g_n\}$ which converges to

$x_1 \in X$ in $G \cup_1 X$. We take an accumulation point $x_2 \in X$ and a subsequence $\{g_{n_i}\}$ such that $g_{n_i} \to x_2$ in $G \cup_2 X$. We take a convergence subsequence $\{g_{n_{i_j}}\}$ with respect to both $G \cup_1 X$ and $G \cup_2 X$. Then the attracting points in $G \cup_1 X$ and $G \cup_2 X$ are x_1 and x_2, respectively. We take an element $x \in X$ which is not the repelling point in either $G \cup_1 X$ or $G \cup_2 X$. We have $g_{n_{i_j}} x \to x_1$ in $G \cup_1 X$ and $g_{n_{i_j}} x \to x_2$ in $G \cup_2 X$. Since we can consider $g_{n_{i_j}} x \to x_1$ and $g_{n_{i_j}} x \to x_2$ in X, we have $x_1 = x_2$. Hence g_n converges to x_1 in $G \cup_2 X$. ☐

Let G be a countable group. For a compact metrizable space X endowed with a convergence action of G, the set $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ of all maximal parabolic subgroups is conjugacy invariant and almost malnormal, that is, $H_1 \cap H_2$ is finite for any different $H_1, H_2 \in \mathfrak{H}(X)$ and every $H \in \mathfrak{H}(X)$ is equal to its normalizer in G ([20, Lemma 3.3]). We call $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ a peripheral structure of X. In general we define a peripheral structure on G as a conjugacy invariant and almost malnormal collection of infinite subgroups of G. For a family $\{\mathfrak{H}_i\}_{i \in I}$ of peripheral structures on G, we define

$$\bigwedge_{i \in I} \mathfrak{H}_i := \{P \subset G \mid P \text{ is infinite and } P = \bigcap_{i \in I} H_i \text{ for some } H_i \in \mathfrak{H}_i \text{ for each } i \in I\},$$

which is also a peripheral structure on G. For two peripheral structures $\mathfrak{H}$ and $\mathfrak{K}$ on G, we put $\mathfrak{K} \to \mathfrak{H}$ if for any $K \in \mathfrak{K}$, there exists $H \in \mathfrak{H}$ such that $K \subset H$. We have the following about $\to$ ([20, Lemma 3.4]):

Lemma 2.2. Let G be a countable group. Then $\to$ is a partial order on the set of peripheral structures on G.

We show some basic properties related to equivariant continuous maps between compact metrizable spaces endowed with convergence actions (refer to [13, Subsection 2.3 and Subsection 2.4] about Lemma 2.3 (1), (2) and (3)).

Lemma 2.3. Let G be a countable group. Let X and Y be compact metrizable spaces endowed with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G. Suppose that there exists a G-equivariant continuous map π from X to Y. Then we have the following:

(1) π is surjective;

(2) π is a unique G-equivariant continuous map from X to Y;

(3) if $r \in Y$ is a conical limit point, then $\pi^{-1}(r)$ consists of one conical limit point;

(4) if $q \in Y$ is a bounded parabolic point and H is its maximal parabolic subgroup, then $\pi^{-1}(q) = \Lambda(H, X)$;

(5) $\mathfrak{H}(X) \to \mathfrak{H}(Y)$;

(6) $id_G \cup \pi : G \cup X \to G \cup Y$ is continuous.

Proof. (1) Minimality of the action on Y implies that π is surjective.

(2) Suppose that $\pi' : X \to Y$ is a G-equivariant continuous map. We take any $p \in X$. There exists a convergence sequence $\{g_i\}$ whose attracting point is p. Then $\pi'(p)$ as well as $\pi(p)$ is the attracting point of the convergence sequence $\{g_i\}$. Hence we have $\pi(p) = \pi'(p)$.

(3) Suppose that $r \in Y$ is a conical limit point. Then we have a convergence sequence $\{g_i\}$ with respect to Y such that the repelling point is r and $g_i r$ converges to $b \in Y$ which is different from the attracting point $a \in Y$. We take a convergence subsequence $\{g_{i_j}\}$ of $\{g_i\}$ with respect to X. We have the repelling point $r' \in X$ and the attracting point $a' \in X$. Also we can assume that $g_{i_j} r'$ converges to $b' \in X$. Then we have $\pi(r') = r$, $\pi(a') = a$ and $\pi(b') = b$. Since $a \neq b$, we have $a' \neq b'$. Hence r' is a conical limit point. Assume that there exists $z \in \pi^{-1}(r)$ such that $z \neq r'$. Then we have $g_{i_j} z \to a'$ and thus $g_{i_j} r \to \pi(a') = a$. This contradicts the fact that $a \neq b$.

(4) Clearly we have $\Lambda(H, X) \subset \pi^{-1}(q)$. Since $\Lambda(H, X)$ has at least one point, we assume that $\pi^{-1}(q)$ has at least two points. We prove that $\pi^{-1}(q) \subset \Lambda(H, X)$. Since $q \in Y$ is a bounded parabolic point, we have a compact subset $K \subset Y \setminus \{q\}$ such that $HK = Y \setminus \{q\}$. We have $H\pi^{-1}(K) = X \setminus \pi^{-1}(q)$. For any $x \in \pi^{-1}(q)$, we have a convergence sequence $\{g_i\}$ whose attracting point is x. If $\{g_i\}$ have a subsequence whose elements belong to a right coset of H, then $x \in \Lambda(H, X)$. We assume that all elements of $\{g_i\}$ belong to mutually different right cosets of H and does not belong to H. Then we have some $h'_i \in H$ and $r_i \in G \setminus H$ such that $g_i = h'_i r_i$ for any i. Since $\pi^{-1}(q)$ has at least two points, we have a point $x' \in \pi^{-1}(q)$ that is not the repelling point of $\{g_i\}$. Hence we have $h'_i r_i x' \to x$ and $r_i x' \notin \pi^{-1}(q)$. We have $h''_i \in H$ and $k'_i \in \pi^{-1}(K)$ such that $r_i x' = h''_i k'_i$. Now we have a sequence $\{h_i := h'_i h''_i\}$ of H and $\{k'_i\}$ of $\pi^{-1}(K)$ such that $h_i k'_i \to x$ in X. Since $x \notin H\pi^{-1}(K)$, we can assume that $\{h_i\}$ is a sequence of mutually different elements. We take a convergence subsequence $\{h_{i_j}\}$ with respect to X. Both its attracting point a and its repelling point r are in $\pi^{-1}(q)$. Since $\pi^{-1}(K)$ is compact and does not contain r, $h_{i_j}(\pi^{-1}(K))$ uniformly converges to a. Then $h_{i_j} k'_{i_j}$ must converge to a. Now we have $x = a$. Hence $\pi^{-1}(q) \subset \Lambda(H, X)$.

(5) We prove $\mathfrak{H}(X) \to \mathfrak{H}(Y)$. We take $K \in \mathfrak{H}(X)$ with the fixed point p. Then $\pi(p)$ is fixed by K. Assume that there exists a loxodromic element $l \in G$ with respect to Y such that $\pi(p)$ is the repelling point of $\{l^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Since $\pi(p)$ is conical, $\pi^{-1}(\pi(p)) = \{p\}$ by Lemma 2.3 (3). Hence l fixes p and thus $l \in K$. Hence l has the only fixed point $\pi(p)$. This contradicts the assumption that l is loxodromic. Hence $\pi(p)$ is a parabolic point with a parabolic subgroup K.

(6) We take a sequence $\{g_n\}$ which converges to $x \in X$ in $G \cup X$. We take any accumulation point $y \in Y$ of $\{g_n\}$ and a subsequence $\{g_{n_i}\}$ such that $g_{n_i} \to y$ in $G \cup Y$. We take a convergence subsequence $\{g_{n_{i_j}}\}$ with respect to both $G \cup X$ and $G \cup Y$. The attracting points in $G \cup X$ and $G \cup Y$ are x and y, respectively. Then x and y are the attracting points in X and Y, respectively. Hence we have $\pi(x) = y$. Thus we have $g_n \to y$ in $G \cup Y$. □

Proof of Proposition 1.6. This follows from Lemma 2.3 (1), (3) and (4). □

Proof of Proposition 1.11. Assume that every $H \in \mathfrak{H}(X)$ is not virtually cyclic and has no non-elementary convergence actions. Let Y be a compact metrizable space endowed with a non-elementary convergence action of G and $\pi : Y \to X$ be a G-equivariant continuous map. By the assumption, every $H \in \mathfrak{H}(X)$ is a parabolic subgroup with respect to Y and hence we have $\mathfrak{H}(X) \to \mathfrak{H}(Y)$. On the other hand Lemma 2.3 (5) implies that we have $\mathfrak{H}(Y) \to \mathfrak{H}(X)$. We have $\mathfrak{H}(Y) = \mathfrak{H}(X)$ by Lemma 2.2. Hence it follows from Proposition 1.6 that π is a G-equivariant homeomorphism. $\square$

Lemma 2.4. Let G be a countable group and X and Y be compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions of G. Let $\phi : G \to G$ be an automorphism of G. Suppose that $\phi(\mathfrak{H}(X)) = \mathfrak{H}(Y)$. Then we have a homeomorphism $\Phi : X \to Y$ such that $\Phi(gx) = \phi(g)\Phi(x)$ for any $g \in G$ and any $x \in X$. Moreover $\phi \cup \Phi : G \cup X \to G \cup Y$ is a homeomorphism.

Proof. When we denote the action on X by $\rho : G \to \mathrm{Homeo}(X)$, $\rho \circ \phi^{-1} : G \to \mathrm{Homeo}(X)$ is another action on X. We denote the compact space X with the action $\rho \circ \phi^{-1}$ by X_ϕ. Then $\rho \circ \phi^{-1}$ is a geometrically finite convergence action of G and the set of maximal parabolic subgroups is nothing but $\phi(\mathfrak{H}(X))$. Then $id_X : X \to X_\phi$ satisfies that $id_X(\rho(g)x) = \rho\circ\phi^{-1}(\phi(g))id_X(x)$ for any $g \in G$ and any $x \in X$. Obviously $\phi \cup id_X : G \cup X \to G \cup X_\phi$ is a homeomorphism. Since $\phi(\mathfrak{H})$ is a proper relatively hyperbolic structure, there exists a G-equivariant homeomorphism $\Phi' : X_\phi \to Y$ (see [29, Theorem 0.1] and also [18, Theorem 5.2]). Then $id_G \cup \Phi' : G \cup X_\phi \to G \cup Y$ is a G-equivariant homeomorphism (Lemma 2.3 (6)). Hence $\Phi := \Phi' \circ id_X : X \to Y$ satisfies the conditions. $\square$

The following definition is based on [13, Subsection 2.4]:

Definition 2.5. Let G be a countable group and $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a family of compact metrizable spaces endowed with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G, where I is a non-empty countable index set. When we consider the diagonal map $\Delta : G \to \prod_{i\in I}(G \cup X_i)$ and the closure $\overline{\Delta(G)}$ of $\Delta(G)$ in $\prod_{i\in I}(G \cup X_i)$, we denote $\overline{\Delta(G)} \setminus \Delta(G)$ by $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$.

Lemma 2.6. Let G be a countable group and $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a family of compact metrizable spaces endowed with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G, where I is a non-empty countable index set. Let Z be a compact metrizable space endowed with a minimal non-elementary convergence action of G and $\pi_i : Z \to X_i$ be a G-equivariant continuous map for every $i \in I$. Then the image of $\prod \pi_i : Z \to \prod_{i\in I} X_i$ is $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$. Also the action of G on $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is a minimal non-elementary convergence action such that $\mathfrak{H}(\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i) = \bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$. In particular $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is the smallest common blow-up of all X_i.

Proof. Since $\Delta \cup \prod_{i\in I} \pi_i : G \cup Z \to \prod_{i\in I}(G \cup X_i)$ is continuous by Lemma 2.3 (6), the image is compact and $\Delta(G)$ is dense in the image. Hence the image is equal to $\overline{\Delta(G)}$ and thus the image of Z is $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$.

Since $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is the image of $\prod \pi_i : Z \to \prod_{i\in I} X_i$ and the action of G on Z is a minimal non-elementary convergence action, the action of G on $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$

is a minimal non-elementary convergence action. We take $H_i \in \mathfrak{H}_i$ for every $i \in I$. If $\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i$ is infinite, then $\{a_i\}_{i\in I} \in \prod_{i\in I} X_i$ is an element of $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$, where a_i is the parabolic point of H_i for every $i \in I$. Also $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ is fixed by $\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i$. If $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ is fixed by $g \in G$ of infinite order, then a_i is fixed by g for every $i \in I$ and thus g belongs to H_i for each $i \in I$. Hence $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a unique fixed point of g and thus g is not loxodromic with respect to $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$. Thus $\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i$ is a parabolic subgroup with respect to $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$. In particular we have $\bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i) \to \mathfrak{H}(\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i)$. Next we prove $\mathfrak{H}(\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i) \to \bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$. We take a parabolic point $\{a_i\}_{i\in I} \in \bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ with the maximal parabolic subgroup $L \in \mathfrak{H}(\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i)$. Then a_i is fixed by L for every $i \in I$. We assume that there exists a loxodromic element $l \in G$ with respect to X_i fixing a_i for some $i \in I$. Since a_i is conical, $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ is conical by Lemma 2.3 (3). This contradicts the fact that any conical limit point is not parabolic ([28, Theorem 3A]). Hence L is a parabolic subgroup with respect to X_i for every $i \in I$. Now we have $\mathfrak{H}(\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i) \to \bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$ and thus $\mathfrak{H}(\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i) = \bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$ by Lemma 2.2. ☐

The first part of the following is a special case of [13, Corollary 1 of Proposition P]. We give a proof for readers.

Lemma 2.7. Let G be a countable group. Let $(\{X_i\}_{i\in I}, \{\phi_{ij} : X_j \to X_i\}_{j>i})$ be a projective system of compact metrizable spaces endowed with minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G and G-equivariant continuous surjections, where I is a non-empty countable directed set. Then the projective limit $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$ is a compact metrizable space with a minimal non-elementary convergence action of G.

Moreover $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$ and $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ are G-equivariant homeomorphic.

Also if $r = \{r_i\}_{i\in I} \in \varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$ is a conical limit point, then there exists $i \in I$ such that $r_i \in X_i$ is a conical limit point.

Proof. Since I is countable, $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$ is a compact metrizable space. We take an element $g \in G$ of infinite order. Let $a_i \in X_i$ be the attracting point of $\{g^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ for any $i \in I$. For any $\phi_{ij} : X_j \to X_i$, we have $\phi_{ij}(a_j) = a_i$. Hence $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ is an element of $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$. Since Ga_i is dense in X_i for any $i \in I$, $G\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ is dense in $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$.

Since we can take a sequence $\{X_{i_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i = \varprojlim_{n\in\mathbb{N}} X_{i_n}$, we assume that $I = \mathbb{N}$. We take any sequence $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ consisting of mutually different elements of G. We take inductively a convergence subsequence of $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with respect to X_i for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. First we take a convergence subsequence $\{g_{n,1}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with respect to X_1. When we have a convergence subsequence $\{g_{n,i}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with respect to X_i, we take a convergence subsequence $\{g_{n,i+1}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\{g_{n,i}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with respect to X_{i+1}. Then the subsequence $\{g_{i,i}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a convergence sequence with respect to $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$.

By universality of the projective limit, we have a G-equivariant continuous map from $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ to $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$. On the other hand we have a G-equivariant continuous map from $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$ to $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ by Lemma 2.6. Then $\varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$ and $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ are G-equivariant homeomorphic by Lemma 2.3 (2).

Suppose that $r = \{r_i\}_{i\in I} \in \varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$ is a conical limit point. Then we have a point $b = \{b_i\}_{i\in I} \in \varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$ and a convergence sequence $\{g_n\}$ with the attracting point $a = \{a_i\}_{i\in I} \in \varprojlim_{i\in I} X_i$ such that r is the repelling point, $g_n(r)$ converges to b and b is not a. There exists $i_0 \in I$ such that $b_{i_0} \neq a_{i_0}$. Hence r_{i_0} is a conical limit point. $\square$

3 Relative hyperbolicity and augmented spaces

In this section, we recall some terminologies about augmented spaces in [17] and show some lemmas.

Let G be a countable group and $\mathbb{H}$ be a finite family of proper infinite subgroups of G. We denote the family of all left cosets by $\alpha := \bigcup_{H\in\mathbb{H}} G/H$. We take a left invariant proper metric d_G on G. We recall the definition of the augmented space $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ (see [17, Section 3] and also [18, Section 4]). We put $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Its vertex set is $G \cup (G \times \{0\}) \cup \bigcup_{A\in\alpha}(A \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})/\sim$, where $G \ni g \sim (g, 0) \in G \times \{0\}$ for any $g \in G$ and $G \times \{0\} \ni (a, 0) \sim (a, 0) \in A \times \{0\}$ for any $A \in \alpha$ and $a \in A$. Its edge is either a vertical edge or a horizontal edge: a vertical edge is a pair $\{(a, t_1), (a, t_2)\} \subset A \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $|t_1 - t_2| = 1$ for $A \in \alpha$; a horizontal edge is a pair $\{(a_1, t), (a_2, t)\} \subset A \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $0 < d_G(a_1, a_2) \leq 2^t$ for $A \in \alpha$ or a pair $\{g_1, g_2\} \subset G$ such that $0 < d_G(g_1, g_2) \leq 1$. We remark that G is finitely generated relative to $\mathbb{H}$ if and only if there exists a left invariant proper metric d_G on G such that the augmented space $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is connected. We suppose that the augmented space $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is connected. Then it has the graph metric $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}$. Also $S := \{g \in G \mid 0 < d_G(e, g) \leq 1\}$ is a finite relatively generating set, that is, S is a finite subset of G and G is generated by $S \cup \bigcup_{H\in\mathbb{H}} H$. We consider the relative Cayley graph $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$. Its vertex set is G. Its edge is a pair $\{g_1, g_2\} \subset G$ such that $0 < d_G(g_1, g_2) \leq 1$ or a pair $\{a_1, a_2\} \subset A$ such that $a_1 \neq a_2$ for $A \in \alpha$. Then the relative Cayley graph $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$ is connected and has the graph metric. When we consider a left invariant proper metric $d_H := d_G|_{H\times H}$ on each $H \in \mathbb{H}$, $X(H, \{H\}, d_H)$ is identified with the full subgraph of $H \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$. For any $A = gH \in \alpha$, the full subgraph of $A \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is $gX(H, \{H\}, d_H) \subset X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$, which is called a combinatorial horoball on A in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$. We take $A = gH \in \alpha$ and $g_1, g_2 \in A$ such that $g_1 \neq g_2$. We consider a path γ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ from g_1 to g_2 that is contained in the combinatorial horoball $gX(H, \{H\}, d_G)$ as follows: if $0 < d_G(g_1, g_2) \leq 1$, then γ is a path of one edge from $(g_1, 0) \in gH \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ to $(g_2, 0) \in gH \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$; if $2^{n-1} < d_G(g_1, g_2) \leq 2^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then γ runs on vertices of $gH \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&(g_1, 0), (g_1, 1), (g_1, 2), \cdots, \\
&(g_1, n-1), (g_1, n), (g_2, n), (g_2, n-1), \\
&\cdots, (g_2, 2), (g_2, 1), (g_2, 0)
\end{aligned}$$

in order. We call such a path the H-typical quasigeodesic from g_1 to g_2. Indeed we can easily confirm that there exist constants $\mu_0 \geq 1$ and $C_0 \geq 0$ such that every H-typical quasigeodesic is a (μ_0, C_0)-quasigeodesic in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ for every $H \in \mathbb{H}$.

We summarize some results in [18, Sections 3, 4, 5] as follows:

Theorem 3.1. Let G be a countable group and $\mathbb{H}$ be a finite family of proper infinite subgroups of G. Then G has a compact metrizable space X endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G such that $\mathbb{H}$ is a set of representatives of conjugacy classes of $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ if and only if G is not virtually cyclic and there exists a left invariant proper metric d_G on G such that $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is connected and hyperbolic. When $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is connected and hyperbolic for a left invariant proper metric d_G on G, the action of G on the ideal boundary $\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is a geometrically finite convergence action such that $\mathbb{H}$ is a set of representatives of conjugacy classes of $\mathfrak{H}(\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G))$ and also the action of G on $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is a convergence action whose limit set is $\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$.

Let G be a countable group and $\mathbb{H}$ be a finite family of proper infinite subgroups of G. Suppose that G is not virtually cyclic and has a left invariant proper metric d_G on G such that $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is connected and hyperbolic. We consider the following maps:

$$i_{\mathbb{H}} : G \to X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G);$$
$$\pi_{\mathbb{H}} : X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G) \to \overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{H}, S),$$

where $i_{\mathbb{H}}$ is the natural embedding and $\pi_{\mathbb{H}}$ is the natural surjection. Then $\pi_{\mathbb{H}} \circ i_{\mathbb{H}}$ is also the natural embedding.

Lemma 3.2. Let G be a countable group and $\mathbb{H}$ be a finite family of proper infinite subgroups of G. Suppose that G is not virtually cyclic and has a left invariant proper metric d_G on G such that $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is connected and hyperbolic. We consider the subset $i_{\mathbb{H}}(G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G) \subset X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$. Then the action of G on $i_{\mathbb{H}}(G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is a convergence action whose limit set is $\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$.

Proof. We prove that any point of $\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is an accumulation point of $i_{\mathbb{H}}(G)$ in the compact space $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$. Since the action of G on $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is proper, $i_{\mathbb{H}}(G)$ is unbounded in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$. Hence we have a point p of $\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ that is an accumulation point of $i_{\mathbb{H}}(G)$. Since the action of G on $\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is minimal, every point of $\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is an accumulation point of $i_{\mathbb{H}}(G)$. $\square$

Remark 3.3. We note that $i_{\mathbb{H}}(G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$ induces a compactification $G \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$ of G. The notations $G \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$ on the above and $G \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$ in Lemma 2.1 are compatible by Lemma 2.1.

We identify $i_{\mathbb{H}}(G)$ and $\pi_{\mathbb{H}} \circ i_{\mathbb{H}}(G)$ with G and also identify $i_{\mathbb{H}}(g)$, $\pi_{\mathbb{H}} \circ i_{\mathbb{H}}(g)$ with g for every $g \in G$. For any locally minimal path γ without backtracking in $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$, by replacing every H-component of γ with the H-typical quasigeodesic for every $H \in \mathbb{H}$, we have a path γ' in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$, which we call the typical lift of γ. See [24] about locally minimal paths without backtracking. The following is a special case of [5, Lemma 7.3] (see also [18, Lemma 6.8]):

Lemma 3.4. *Let G be a countable group and $\mathbb{H}$ be a finite family of proper infinite subgroups of G. Suppose that G is not virtually cyclic and has a left invariant proper metric d_G on G such that $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is connected and hyperbolic. For any constants $\mu \geq 1$ and $C \geq 0$, there exist constants $\mu' \geq 1$ and $C' \geq 0$ such that the typical lift of any locally minimal (μ, C)-quasigeodesic without backtracking in $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$ is a (μ', C')-quasigeodesic in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$.*

Lemma 3.5. *Let G be a countable group and $\mathbb{H}$ be a finite family of proper infinite subgroups of G. Suppose that G is not virtually cyclic and has a left invariant proper metric d_G on G such that $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is connected and hyperbolic. Then for each pair of constants (μ, C) with $\mu \geq 1$ and $C \geq 0$, there exists a non-decreasing function $f_1 = f_1^{(\mu,C)} : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ such that $f_1(N) \to \infty$ as $N \to \infty$ and f_1 satisfies the following: for any $A = gH \in \alpha$, any $g_1, g_2 \in A$ such that $g_1 \neq g_2$, any (μ, C)-quasigeodesic γ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ from g_1 to g_2, and any $N > 0$, if $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e, g_i) \geq N$ for $i = 1, 2$, then $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e, \gamma) \geq f_1(N)$.*

Proof. There exist constants $\mu_0 \geq 1$ and $C_0 \geq 0$ such that any H-typical quasigeodesic is a (μ_0, C_0)-quasigeodesic in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ for every $H \in \mathbb{H}$.

We put $d_H := d_G|_{H \times H}$. There exists a constant $c_1 \geq 0$ such that $gX(H, \{H\}, d_H)$ is a c_1-quasiconvex subgraph of $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ for every $A = gH \in \alpha$ because $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is hyperbolic and we can easily confirm that there exist constants $\mu_1' \geq 1, c_1' \geq 0$ such that $gX(H, \{H\}, d_H)$ is a (μ_1', c_1')-quasi-isometrically embedded subgraph of $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ for every $A = gH \in \alpha$.

We fix a vertex $(a, 0) \in A \times \{0\}$ that is one of the nearest vertices from e for every $A \in \alpha$. Then there exists a constant $c_2 \geq 0$ such that any geodesic from e to any vertex in $gX(H, \{H\}, d_H)$ intersects the c_2-neighborhood of $(a, 0)$ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ for any $A = gH \in \alpha$ because $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is hyperbolic and $gX(H, \{H\}, d_H)$ is c_1-quasiconvex for any $A = gH \in \alpha$.

We take $A = gH \in \alpha$, $g_1, g_2 \in A$ such that $g_1 \neq g_2$. We denote the H-typical quasigeodesic from g_1 to g_2 by γ_0. Now we claim that

$$d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e, v) \geq \frac{1}{\mu_0} \min_{i=1,2} \frac{1}{2} d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a, g_i) - \frac{C_0}{\mu_0} - 2c_2$$

for any vertex v of γ_0. Indeed we have $v = (g_i, m)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and some $m \geq 0$. We fix i on the above and denote the H-typical quasigeodesic from a to g_i by γ_i. We put

$$n_i := \max\{n \mid (g_i, n) \text{ is a vertex of } \gamma_i\}.$$

For each $0 \leq k \leq n_i$, we denote the length of the segment of γ_i with endpoints a and (g_i, k) by $l(k)$. Since γ_i is a (μ_0, C_0)-quasigeodesic, we have

$$\mu_0 d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a, (g_i, k)) + C_0 \geq l(k).$$

Also we have

$$l(k) \geq \frac{1}{2} d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a, g_i).$$

Hence if $m \leq n_i$, then

$$\mu_0 d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,(g_i,m)) + C_0 \geq \frac{1}{2} d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,g_i).$$

Also if $m \geq n_i$, then $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,(g_i,m)) \geq d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,(g_i,n_i))$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_0 d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,(g_i,m)) + C_0 &\geq \mu_0 d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,(g_i,n_i)) + C_0 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,g_i).\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\mu_0 d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,v) + C_0 \geq \frac{1}{2} d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,g_i).$$

Since it follows from the choice of c_2 that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,v) &\geq d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,a) + d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,v) - 2c_2 \\ &\geq d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,v) - 2c_2,\end{aligned}$$

the claim follows.

We take $N > 0$ and suppose that $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,g_i) \geq N$ for $i = 1, 2$. If $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,a) \geq \frac{2N}{3}$, then it follows from the choice of a that

$$d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,\gamma_0) \geq d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,a) \geq \frac{2N}{3}.$$

If $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,a) < \frac{2N}{3}$, then

$$d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(a,g_i) \geq d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,g_i) - d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,a) > \frac{N}{3}$$

for $i = 1, 2$. Hence the claim above implies that

$$d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,\gamma_0) > \frac{N}{6\mu_0} - \frac{C_0}{\mu_0} - 2c_2.$$

We note that $\frac{2N}{3} > \frac{N}{6\mu_0} - \frac{C_0}{\mu_0} - 2c_2$.

There exists a constant $c_3 \geq 0$ such that any (μ, C)-quasigeodesic γ from g_1 to g_2 is contained in the c_3-neighborhood of γ_0 because $X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)$ is hyperbolic and γ_0 is a (μ_0, C_0)-quasigeodesic. Hence we have

$$d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e,\gamma) > \frac{N}{6\mu_0} - \frac{C_0}{\mu_0} - 2c_2 - c_3.$$

Thus we obtain a desired function f_1 which is defined by $f_1(N) = \max\left\{\frac{N}{6\mu_0} - \frac{C_0}{\mu_0} - 2c_2 - c_3, 0\right\}$. $\square$

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We fix some notations in this section. Let G be a countable group. Let X and Y be compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions of G such that $\mathfrak{H}(X) \to \mathfrak{H}(Y)$. Let $\mathbb{K}$ and $\mathbb{H}$ be sets of representatives of conjugacy classes of $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ and $\mathfrak{H}(Y)$, respectively and satisfy that for any $K \in \mathbb{K}$, there exists $H \in \mathbb{H}$ such that $K \subset H$ (see [20, Lemma 3.5]). Let d_G be a left invariant proper metric on G. By rescaling d_G if necessary, we assume that G is generated by $S \cup \bigcup_{K \in \mathbb{K}} K$, where $S := \{g \in G \mid 0 < d_G(e,g) \leq 1\}$, and that any $H \in \mathbb{H}$ is generated by $(S \cap H) \cup \bigcup_{K \in \mathbb{K}_H} K$, where $\mathbb{K}_H := \{K \in \mathbb{K} \mid K \subset H\}$. Obviously G is also generated by $S \cup \bigcup_{H \in \mathbb{H}} H$. We consider the augmented spaces $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ and $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ and the relative Cayley graphs $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$ and $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{K}, S)$. We have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
G \arrow[r, "id_G"] \arrow[d, "i_{\mathbb{K}}"'] & G \arrow[d, "i_{\mathbb{H}}"] \\
X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi_{\mathbb{K}}"'] & X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G) \arrow[d, "\pi_{\mathbb{H}}"] \\
\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{K}, S) \arrow[r] & \overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{H}, S).
\end{tikzcd}$$

We identify $i_{\mathbb{H}}(G)$, $i_{\mathbb{K}}(G)$, $\pi_{\mathbb{H}} \circ i_{\mathbb{H}}(G)$ and $\pi_{\mathbb{K}} \circ i_{\mathbb{K}}(G)$ with G and also identify $i_{\mathbb{H}}(g)$, $i_{\mathbb{K}}(g)$, $\pi_{\mathbb{H}} \circ i_{\mathbb{H}}(g)$ and $\pi_{\mathbb{K}} \circ i_{\mathbb{K}}(g)$ with g for every $g \in G$.

Since G properly isometrically acts on $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ and $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$, the induced metrics $i_{\mathbb{K}}^* d_{X(G,\mathbb{K},d_G)}$ and $i_{\mathbb{H}}^* d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}$ on G are left invariant proper metrics on G. It is well-known that such metrics are coarsely equivalent. In particular we have the following:

Lemma 4.1. There exists a non-decreasing function $f_2 : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ satisfying $f_2(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$ such that for any $g_1, g_2 \in G$,

$$f_2(d_{X(G,\mathbb{K},d_G)}(g_1, g_2)) \leq d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(g_1, g_2).$$

The following is [31, Proposition 3.8]:

Lemma 4.2. There exist constants $\mu \geq 1$ and $C \geq 0$ such that for any geodesic $\overline{\gamma}_{\mathbb{H}}$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$, its minimal lift $\overline{\gamma}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is a locally minimal (μ, C)-quasigeodesic without backtracking in $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{K}, S)$. Here a minimal lift $\overline{\gamma}_{\mathbb{K}}$ of $\overline{\gamma}_{\mathbb{H}}$ is a path given by replacing every H-component of $\overline{\gamma}_{\mathbb{H}}$ with a geodesic in $\overline{\Gamma}(H, \mathbb{K}_H, H \cap S)$ for every $H \in \mathbb{H}$.

The following is based on the proof of [22, Lemma 2.1]:

Lemma 4.3. Suppose that for any $N > 0$ there exists $M > 0$ satisfying the following: if a geodesic $\gamma_{\mathbb{K}}$ in $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ from $g_1 \in G$ to $g_2 \in G$ satisfies $d_{X(G,\mathbb{K},d_G)}(e, \gamma_{\mathbb{K}}) > M$, then every geodesic $\gamma_{\mathbb{H}}$ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ from g_1 to g_2 satisfies $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e, \gamma_{\mathbb{H}}) > N$. Then the identity map $id_G : G \to G$ extends to a G-equivariant continuous map from $G \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ to $G \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$.

Proof. Suppose that the identity map $id_G : G \to G$ cannot extend to a G-equivariant continuous map from $G \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ to $G \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.2 and Remark 3.3 that we have two sequences $\{g_n\}$, $\{g'_n\}$, a point $q \in \partial X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ and two different points $p, p' \in \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ such that $g_n \to q$, $g'_n \to q$ in $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$, and $g_n \to p$, $g'_n \to p'$ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$. We take a geodesic $\gamma_{\mathbb{K},n}$ in $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ from g_n to g'_n and a geodesic $\gamma_{\mathbb{H},n}$ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ from g_n to g'_n for every n. Since $g_n \to p$, $g'_n \to p'$ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ and $p \neq p'$, there exists $N_1 > 0$ and $N_2 > 0$ such that for any $n > N_1$, $\gamma_{\mathbb{H},n} \cap \{x \in X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G) \mid d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e, x) \leq N_2\} \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, since $g_n \to q$, $g'_n \to q$ in $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G) \cup \partial X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$, for any $M > 0$, there exists $N_3 > 0$ such that for any $n > N_3$, $d_{X(G,\mathbb{K},d_G)}(e, \gamma_{\mathbb{K},n}) > M$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.1. For every $(g_1, g_2) \in G \times G$, we fix four paths from g_1 to g_2: the first path which is denoted by $\overline{\gamma_{\mathbb{H}}}(g_1, g_2)$ is a geodesic in $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{H}, S)$; the second path which is denoted by $\overline{\gamma_{\mathbb{K}}}(g_1, g_2)$ is a minimal lift of $\overline{\gamma_{\mathbb{H}}}(g_1, g_2)$ in $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{K}, S)$; the third path which is denoted by $\gamma_{\mathbb{H}}(g_1, g_2)$ is the typical lift of $\overline{\gamma_{\mathbb{H}}}(g_1, g_2)$ in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$; the fourth path which is denoted by $\gamma_{\mathbb{K}}(g_1, g_2)$ is the typical lift of $\overline{\gamma_{\mathbb{K}}}(g_1, g_2)$ in $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$. We note that $G \cap \gamma_{\mathbb{H}}(g_1, g_2) = G \cap \overline{\gamma_{\mathbb{H}}}(g_1, g_2) \subset G \cap \gamma_{\mathbb{K}}(g_1, g_2) = G \cap \overline{\gamma_{\mathbb{K}}}(g_1, g_2)$. It follows from Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 3.4 that we have constants $\mu \geq 1$ and $C \geq 0$ such that for any $(g_1, g_2) \in G \times G$, $\overline{\gamma_{\mathbb{K}}}(g_1, g_2)$, $\gamma_{\mathbb{H}}(g_1, g_2)$ and $\gamma_{\mathbb{K}}(g_1, g_2)$ are (μ, C)-quasigeodesics in $\overline{\Gamma}(G, \mathbb{K}, S)$, $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ and $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$, respectively. Since $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ and $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ are hyperbolic, we have a constant $c \geq 0$ such that for any $(g_1, g_2) \in G \times G$, $\gamma_{\mathbb{H}}(g_1, g_2)$ is contained in a c-neighborhood of any geodesic from g_1 to g_2 in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ and also $\gamma_{\mathbb{K}}(g_1, g_2)$ is contained in a c-neighborhood of any geodesic from g_1 to g_2 in $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$.

We take a function f_1 in Lemma 3.5 and a function f_2 in Lemma 4.1. We consider a function $F : [0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto f_1(f_2(\max\{t - c, 0\})) - c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then F is non-decreasing and satisfies $F(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$.

We take $t \geq 0$, $(g_1, g_2) \in G \times G$, a geodesic $\gamma'_{\mathbb{K}}$ from g_1 to g_2 in $X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ and a geodesic $\gamma'_{\mathbb{H}}$ from g_1 to g_2 in $X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$. We suppose that $d_{X(G,\mathbb{K},d_G)}(e, \gamma'_{\mathbb{K}}) > t$. Then we have $d_{X(G,\mathbb{K},d_G)}(e, \gamma_{\mathbb{K}}(g_1, g_2)) > t - c$ and thus $d_{X(G,\mathbb{K},d_G)}(e, G \cap \gamma_{\mathbb{K}}(g_1, g_2)) > t - c$. We have $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e, G \cap \gamma_{\mathbb{H}}(g_1, g_2)) \geq f_2(d_{X(G,\mathbb{K},d_G)}(e, G \cap \gamma_{\mathbb{K}}(g_1, g_2))) \geq f_2(\max\{t - c, 0\})$ by Lemma 4.1. It follows from Lemma 3.5 that we have $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e, \gamma_{\mathbb{H}}(g_1, g_2)) \geq f_1(f_2(\max\{t - c, 0\}))$. We have $d_{X(G,\mathbb{H},d_G)}(e, \gamma'_{\mathbb{H}}) \geq f_1(f_2(\max\{t - c, 0\})) - c = F(t)$.

For any $N > 0$, we can take $M > 0$ such that $F(M) > N$ because $F(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$. Then M satisfies the condition in Lemma 4.3. Hence we have a G-equivariant continuous map from $\partial X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ to $\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$. Since $\partial X(G, \mathbb{K}, d_G)$ is G-equivariant homeomorphic to X and $\partial X(G, \mathbb{H}, d_G)$ is G-equivariant homeomorphic to Y, we have a G-equivariant continuous map from X to Y. ☐

Corollary 4.4. Let G be a countable group and X and Y be compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions of G. Let

$\phi : G \to G$ be an automorphism of G. Suppose that $\phi(\mathfrak{H}(X)) \to \mathfrak{H}(Y)$. Then we have a continuous surjective map $\pi : X \to Y$ such that $\pi(gx) = \phi(g)\pi(x)$ for any $g \in G$ and any $x \in X$. Moreover $\phi \cup \pi : G \cup X \to G \cup Y$ is continuous.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 1.1, Remark 1.3 and Lemma 2.4. □

Proof of Proposition 1.10. Let G be a countable group and X_0 be a compact metrizable space with a geometrically finite convergence action of G. We consider the set $\{l_k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of all loxodromic elements of G. We denote the virtual normalizer $V_G(l_k)$ of l_k by H_k. Also we denote the conjugacy class represented by H_k by $\mathfrak{H}'_k$. When we put $\mathfrak{H}_0 := \mathfrak{H}(X)$, $\mathfrak{H}_n := \mathfrak{H}(X) \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} \mathfrak{H}'_k$ is also a proper relatively hyperbolic structure for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In fact if $\mathfrak{H}_{n-1}$ is a proper relatively hyperbolic structure, then H_n belongs to $\mathfrak{H}_{n-1} \setminus \mathfrak{H}_0$ or is hyperbolically embedded into G relative to $\mathfrak{H}_{n-1}$ ([25, Corollary 1.7]). Hence $\mathfrak{H}_n = \mathfrak{H}_{n-1} \cup \mathfrak{H}'_n$ is a proper relatively hyperbolic structure on G. When we take a compact metrizable space X_n endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action such that $\mathfrak{H}(X_n) = \mathfrak{H}_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have a unique G-equivariant surjection $\pi_n : X_{n-1} \to X_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by theorem 1.1 and Remark 1.3. Then the directed limit $X_\infty := \varinjlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$ is not Hausdorff. Indeed assume that X_∞ is Hausdorff. Then the action of G on X_∞ is a non-elementary convergence action. Hence we have a loxodromic element $l \in G$ with respect to X_∞. Then l is also loxodromic with respect to X_0. However l is an element of a parabolic subgroup with respect to X_n for some n. In particular l has exactly one fixed point in X_∞. This contradicts the assumption that l is loxodromic with respect to X_∞.

Assume that there exists a common blow-down Y of all X_n. We have a loxodromic element $l \in G$ with respect to Y. Since each X_n is a blow-up of Y, l is a loxodromic element with respect to each X_n. This contradicts the fact that l is an element of a parabolic subgroup with respect to some X_n. □

5 Proofs of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5

In order to prove Theorem 1.4, we need the following:

Lemma 5.1. Let $L(0)$ be a finitely generated and virtually non-abelian free group. Then there exists a sequence of subgroups $\{L(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the following:

(1) $L(k)$ is isomorphic to a finitely generated and virtually non-abelian free group for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$;

(2) $L(k)$ is an almost malnormal and quasiconvex subgroup of $L(k-1)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$;

(3) $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} L(k)$ is a finite subgroup of $L(0)$.

Proof. We fix a finite index free subgroup $M(0)$ of $L(0)$ and put $M(0) \setminus \{e\} = \{m_k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We construct $L(k)$ inductively. Suppose that $L(k-1)$ is constructed for a positive integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If m_k does not belong to $L(k-1)$, we put $L(k) = L(k-1)$. If m_k belongs to $L(k-1)$, then we have an infinite virtually cyclic subgroup $E(k)$ of $L(k-1)$ which contains m_k and satisfies that $L(k-1)$ is hyperbolic relative to $\{E(k)\}$ by [25, Corollary 1.7]. It follows from Theorem B.1 (or [21, Theorem 1.2]) that there exists a subgroup $L(k)$ of $L(k-1)$ satisfying the following:

(i) $L(k)$ is finitely generated, virtually non-abelian free;

(ii) $L(k-1)$ is hyperbolic relative to $\{E(k), L(k)\}$.

By [25, Theorem 1.5], $L(k)$ is an almost malnormal and quasiconvex subgroup of $L(k-1)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By [24, Proposition 2.36], $E(k) \cap L(k)$ is finite and thus m_k does not belong to $L(k)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence we have $\left(\bigcap_{k\in\mathbb{N}} L(k)\right) \cap M(0) = \{e\}$. Since $M(0)$ is a finite index subgroup of $L(0)$, $\bigcap_{k\in\mathbb{N}} L(k)$ is finite. □

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By Theorem B.1 (or [21, Theorem 1.2]), G admits a finitely generated and virtually non-abelian free subgroup $L(0)$ which is hyperbolically embedded into G relative to $\mathfrak{H}(X)$. We take a sequence $\{L(n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of subgroups of $L(0)$ described in Lemma 5.1 and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we put

$$\mathfrak{K}_n = \{P \subset L(n-1) \mid P = lL(n)l^{-1} \text{ for some } l \in L(n-1)\}.$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{K}_n$ is a proper relatively hyperbolic structure on $L(n-1)$ and hence there exists a finitely generated and virtually non-abelian free subgroup $H(n,n)$ of $L(n-1)$ which is hyperbolically embedded into $L(n-1)$ relative to $\mathfrak{K}_n$ by Theorem B.1 (or [21, Theorem 1.2]). We take a sequence $\{H(n,n+m)\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ of subgroups of $H(n,n)$ described in Lemma 5.1 for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, that is, $\{H(n,n+m)\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the following:

- $H(n,n+m)$ is isomorphic to a finitely generated and virtually non-abelian free group for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$;
- $H(n,n+m)$ is an almost malnormal and quasiconvex subgroup of $H(n,n+m-1)$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$;
- $\bigcap_{m\in\mathbb{N}} H(n,n+m)$ is a finite subgroup of $H(n,n)$.

For each $\lambda \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we put

$$I(\lambda,n) = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid i \leq n \text{ and } \lambda(i) = 1\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{H}_\lambda^{(n)} = \mathfrak{H}(X) \quad &\cup \bigcup_{i\in I(\lambda,n)} \{P \subset G \mid P = gH(i,n)g^{-1} \text{ for some } g \in G\} \\ &\cup \quad \{P \subset G \mid P = gL(n)g^{-1} \text{ for some } g \in G\}.\end{aligned}$$

We can confirm that $\mathfrak{H}_\lambda^{(n)}$ is a proper relatively hyperbolic structure on G by using [25, Theorem 1.5]. Also we have $\mathfrak{H}_\lambda^{(n)} \to \mathfrak{H}_\lambda^{(m)}$ if $n \geq m$. We take a compact metrizable space $X_\lambda^{(n)}$ endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G such that $\mathfrak{H}(X_\lambda^{(n)}) = \mathfrak{H}_\lambda^{(n)}$. By Theorem 1.1, $X_\lambda^{(n)}$ is a blow-up of $X_\lambda^{(m)}$ if $n \geq m$. We put $X_\lambda = \varprojlim_{n\in\mathbb{N}} X_\lambda^{(n)}$.

Now we prove the assertions (1) and (2). Since we have $\mathfrak{H}(X) \to \mathfrak{H}(X_\lambda^{(n)})$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from Theorem 1.1 that $X_\lambda^{(n)}$ is a blow-down of X. Hence the induced action of G on X_λ is a minimal non-elementary convergence action and X_λ is a blow-down of X such that $\mathfrak{H}(X_\lambda) = \bigwedge_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{H}_\lambda^{(n)}$ by Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7. Moreover we have $\mathfrak{H}(X_\lambda) = \mathfrak{H}(X)$ by the condition (3) in Lemma 5.1.

Next we prove the assertion (3). Take any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. If $\lambda^{-1}(\{1\}) \supset \lambda'^{-1}(\{1\})$, then we can confirm that X_λ is a blow-down of $X_{\lambda'}$ in a similar way to the above argument. Now we suppose that $\lambda(n) = 0$ and $\lambda'(n) = 1$ for some n. Since $H(n,n)$ is strongly quasiconvex relative to $\mathfrak{H}_\lambda^{(n)}$ in G, the limit set $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_\lambda^{(n)})$ endowed with the induced action of $H(n,n)$ consists of conical limit points (see [18, Theorem 1.2]). Since $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_\lambda)$ is a blow-up of $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_\lambda^{(n)})$, it follows from Lemma 2.3 (3) that the limit set $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_\lambda)$ endowed with the induced action of $H(n,n)$ also consists of conical limit points. On the other hand $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_{\lambda'})$ endowed with the induced action of $H(n,n)$ has a point which is not conical. Indeed we take the parabolic point $p_m \in X_{\lambda'}^{(n+m)}$ of $H(n, n+m)$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Then $\{p_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}}$ defines a unique point $p_{\lambda'}$ of $X_{\lambda'}$. Since any p_m is not a conical limit point of $X_{\lambda'}^{(n+m)}$ with respect to the induced action of $H(n,n)$, it follows from Lemma 2.7 that $p_{\lambda'}$ is not a conical limit point of $X_{\lambda'}$ with respect to the induced action of $H(n,n)$. Also since p_0 is a bounded parabolic point of $X_{\lambda'}^{(n)}$ and its maximal parabolic subgroup is $H(n,n)$, it follows from Lemma 2.3 (4) that $p_{\lambda'}$ belongs to $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_{\lambda'})$. Assume that X_λ is a blow-down of $X_{\lambda'}$. Then $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_\lambda)$ is also a blow-down of $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_{\lambda'})$. In view of Lemma 2.3 (3), this contradicts the facts that $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_\lambda)$ consists of conical limit points and that $\Lambda(H(n,n), X_{\lambda'})$ has a point which is not conical.

The assertion (4) follows from the assertion (3).

Since $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ is a proper relatively hyperbolic structure on G, the assertion (5) follows from the assertion (1) and (4). □

Remark 5.2. We consider a characteristic function $\chi_{\{1,\ldots,n\}} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define X_n by $X_{\chi_{\{1,\ldots,n\}}}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ on the above proof, and put $X_0 = X$. Then X_n is a blow-down of X_m for $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $n \geq m$. We can easily confirm that X_n for each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ has exactly n G-orbits of points which are neither conical nor parabolic. Since any conjugacy between minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G preserves conical limit points and parabolic points, X_n and X_m for any different $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ are not conjugate.

Remark 5.3. Suppose that G is finitely generated and G has a compact metrizable space X endowed with a geometrically finite convergence group action. Since $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is countable, it follows from Theorem 1.4 that the set of all conjugacy classes of minimal non-elementary convergence actions of G whose peripheral structures are equal to $\mathfrak{H}(X)$ is uncountable.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. This is proved in a similar way in Proof of Theorem 1.4, where $\{H(n, n+m)\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is replaced by $\{H(n,n)\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ for each $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. We omit details. $\square$

6 Proof of Theorem 1.7

The following is a corollary of [6, Proposition 1.10] (see also [30, Theorem 1.1]):

Lemma 6.1. Let G be a finitely generated group. Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a finite family of compact metrizable spaces endowed with geometrically finite convergence actions of G. Let Z be a compact metrizable space endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action of G and $\pi_i : Z \to X_i$ be a G-equivariant continuous map for every $i \in I$. When we take $H_i \in \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$ for every $i \in I$, we have $\bigcap_{i\in I} \Lambda(H_i, Z) = \Lambda(\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i, Z)$.

Proof. We take $i \in I$ and $H_i \in \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$. The induced action of H_i on Z is elementary or geometrically finite (see for example [31, Theorem 1.1]). Also when we take $g \notin H_i$ and the parabolic points $p \in X_i$ of H_i and $q \in X_i$ of gH_ig^{-1}, we have $p \neq q$. Hence we have $\pi_i^{-1}(p) \cap \pi_i^{-1}(q) = \emptyset$ and thus $\Lambda(H_i, Z) \cap g\Lambda(H_i, Z) = \emptyset$. In particular H_i is fully quasiconvex with respect to Z. When we use [6, Proposition 1.10] inductively, we have the assertion. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.7. First we suppose that I is a finite index set. Since I is a finite set, $\bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$ is a proper relatively hyperbolic structure by [20, Proposition 7.1]. Hence we have a compact metrizable space Z endowed with a geometrically finite convergence action such that $\mathfrak{H}(Z) = \bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$. It follows from Theorem 1.1 that we have a G-equivariant continuous map $\pi_i : Z \to X_i$ for every $i \in I$. The image of $\prod_{i\in I} \pi_i : Z \to \prod_{i\in I} X_i$ is $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ and the action of G on $\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is a minimal non-elementary convergence action such that $\mathfrak{H}(\bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i) = \bigwedge_{i\in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$ by Lemma 2.6. We take $\{r_i\}_{i\in I} \in \bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$. If $r_i \in X_i$ is conical for some $i \in I$, then $\{r_i\}_{i\in I}$ is conical and thus $(\prod_{i\in I} \pi_i)^{-1}(\{r_i\}_{i\in I})$ consists of one point by Lemma 2.3 (3). Suppose that $r_i \in X_i$ is parabolic and $H_i \in \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$ is the maximal parabolic subgroup for every $i \in I$. Since I is a finite set, we have $\bigcap_{i\in I} \pi_i^{-1}(r_i) = \bigcap_{i\in I} \Lambda(H_i, Z) = \Lambda(\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i, Z)$ by Lemma 2.3 (4) and Lemma 6.1. If $\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i$ is finite, then $\Lambda(\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i, Z) = \emptyset$. This contradicts the fact that $\{r_i\}_{i\in I}$ belongs to the image of $\prod_{i\in I} \pi_i : Z \to \prod_{i\in I} X_i$. If $\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i$ is infinite, then $\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i$ is parabolic and thus $\Lambda(\bigcap_{i\in I} H_i, Z)$ consists of one point. Hence $(\prod_{i\in I} \pi_i)^{-1}(\{r_i\}_{i\in I})$ consists of one point. Thus $Z \ni z \mapsto \{\pi_i(z)\}_{i\in I} \in \bigwedge_{i\in I} X_i$ is a G-equivariant homeomorphism.

Next we suppose that I is not necessarily finite. We consider a countable directed non-empty set J consisting of finite subsets of I, where $j < j'$ for each

$j, j' \in J$ is defined by $j \subset j'$. We define $X_j := \bigwedge_{i \in j} X_i$ for each $j \in J$ and the natural G-equivariant surjection $\pi_{jj'} : X_{j'} \to X_j$ for each $j, j' \in J$ such that $j < j'$. Since the action of G on X_j is a geometrically finite convergence action by the former argument, we have a projective system of geometrically finite convergence actions of G. Since J is countable, $\varprojlim_{j \in J} X_j$ is naturally endowed with a minimal non-elementary convergence action of G by Lemma 2.7. We have a G-equivariant continuous map $\pi_i : \varprojlim_{j \in J} X_j \to X_i$ for any $i \in I$. Hence it follows from Lemma 2.6 that the image of $\prod_{i \in I} \pi_i : \varprojlim_{j \in J} X_j \to \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is $\bigwedge_{i \in I} X_i$ and the action of G on $\bigwedge_{i \in I} X_i$ is a non-elementary convergence action such that $\mathfrak{H}(\bigwedge_{i \in I} X_i) = \bigwedge_{i \in I} \mathfrak{H}(X_i)$. □

Remark 6.2. On the last part, we can prove that $\varprojlim_{j \in J} X_j$ and $\bigwedge_{i \in I} X_i$ are G-equivariant homeomorphic. Indeed we have the natural projection $\bigwedge_{i \in I} X_i \to X_j$ for any $j \in J$ and thus we have a G-equivariant continuous map $\bigwedge_{i \in I} X_i \to \varprojlim_{j \in J} X_j$. It follows from Lemma 2.3 (2) that $\varprojlim_{j \in J} X_j$ and $\bigwedge_{i \in I} X_i$ are G-equivariant homeomorphic.

Appendix A Groups with no non-elementary convergence actions

There exists a criterion for countable groups to have no proper relatively hyperbolic structures (see [19, Theorem 1] together with [5, Definition 1], and also [1, Theorem 2]). In this appendix we show a similar criterion (Corollary A.2) for countable groups to have no non-elementary convergence actions. It follows from the criterion that $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ $(n \geq 3)$, the mapping class group of an orientable surface of genus g with p punctures, where $3g + p \geq 5$ and so on have no non-elementary convergence actions by the same argument in [19, Section 8]. We note that a countable group with no subgroups which are isomorphic to the free group of rank 2 has no non-elementary convergence actions (see [27, Theorem 2U]).

Let G be a group with a family $\{G_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of subgroups such that G is generated by $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} G_\lambda$. We consider a property (P) defined for groups. We define a (P)-graph $\Gamma(\{G_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}, (P))$ of $\{G_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ as follows: the set of vertices is $\{G_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and the set of edges is $\{G_{\lambda,\mu} | \ G_{\lambda,\mu} \text{ satisfies (P)}, \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda, \lambda \neq \mu\}$, where $G_{\lambda,\mu}$ is a subgroup of G generated by G_λ and G_μ. An edge $G_{\lambda,\mu}$ has two ends G_λ and G_μ. Suppose that S is a generating set of G. Then we consider a family $\{\langle s \rangle\}_{s \in S}$ of subgroups of G and we denote $\Gamma(\{\langle s \rangle\}_{s \in S}, (P))$ by $\Gamma(S, (P))$. We note that $\Gamma(S, (P))$ has been studied (see [19, Introduction]).

If a countable group G is infinite and has no non-elementary convergence actions, then we say that G satisfies $(\ell = 1, 2)$.

Proposition A.1. Let G be a countable group with a family $\{G_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of infinite subgroups such that G is generated by $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} G_\lambda$. If the $(\ell = 1, 2)$-graph $\Gamma(\{G_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}, (\ell = 1, 2))$ is connected, then G satisfies $(\ell = 1, 2)$.

Proof. We consider a convergence action of G on a compact metrizable space X.

We assume that for some λ and μ such that $\lambda \neq \mu$, $G_{\lambda,\mu}$ is a parabolic subgroup. We denote the parabolic point by $p \in X$. Then G_λ and G_μ are parabolic subgroups and fix p. For each $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ such that $G_{\lambda,\lambda'}$ satisfies $(l = 1, 2)$, $G_{\lambda,\lambda'}$ cannot have loxodromic elements. Hence $G_{\lambda,\lambda'}$ fixes p and thus $G_{\lambda,\lambda'}$ is parabolic. Then $G_{\lambda'}$ is also parabolic and fixes p. Since $\Gamma(\{G_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Lambda}, (l = 1, 2))$ is connected, for any $\alpha \in \Lambda$, G_α fixes p. Thus G fixes p since G is generated by $\bigcup_{\alpha\in\Lambda} G_\alpha$. Since G contains $G_{\lambda,\mu}$ and thus cannot contain any loxodromic elements, G is parabolic.

We assume that for any λ and μ such that $\lambda \neq \mu$, $G_{\lambda,\mu}$ is not parabolic. We take $G_{\lambda,\mu}$ which is an edge. Then $\Lambda(G_{\lambda,\mu}, X)$ is a set of exactly two points $r, a \in X$ and thus $G_{\lambda,\mu}$ is virtually infinite cyclic. Hence G_λ is virtually infinite cyclic and has a loxodromic element which fixes $r, a \in X$. For each $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ such that $G_{\lambda,\lambda'}$ is an edge, $G_{\lambda,\lambda'}$ have a loxodromic element. Hence $\Lambda(G_{\lambda,\lambda'}, X)$ is a set of exactly two points $r, a \in X$. For any $\alpha \in \Lambda$, G_α fixes r, a since $\Gamma(\{G_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Lambda}, (l = 1, 2))$ is connected. Thus G fixes r, a since G is generated by $\bigcup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} G_\lambda$. Hence $\Lambda(G, X)$ is the set of exactly two points $r, a \in X$. □

A group satisfies (A) if G is abelian. Since infinite abelian groups satisfy $(\ell = 1, 2)$, we have the following (compare with [1, Theorem 2]):

Corollary A.2. Let G be a countable group with a generating set S of G. Suppose that any element of S is of infinite order. If the (A)-graph $\Gamma(S, (A))$ is connected, then G satisfies $(\ell = 1, 2)$.

Appendix B Hyperbolically embedded virtually free subgroups of relatively hyperbolic groups

In this appendix, we give a remark on hyperbolically embedded subgroups of relatively hyperbolic groups in the sense of [25] as a continuation of [21]. After the first version of [21] appeared, the notion of a hyperbolically embedded subgroup was further generalized in [7]. We see that the argument in the proof of [7, Theorem 6.14 (c)] gives an alternative proof of [21, Theorem 1.2]. In fact we have a stronger version of [21, Theorem 1.2].

Theorem B.1. Suppose that a group G is not virtually cyclic and is hyperbolic relative to a family $\mathbb{K}$ of proper subgroups in the sense of [24]. Then G contains a maximal finite normal subgroup $K(G)$. Moreover for every positive integer m, there exists a subgroup H of G such that H is the direct product of a free subgroup of rank m and $K(G)$ and that H is hyperbolically embedded into G relative to $\mathbb{K}$.

Proof. The former assertion follows from [2, Lemma 3.3].

We prove the latter assertion. For the case where $m = 1$, the assertion follows from [25, Corollaries 1.7 and 4.5] and [2, Lemma 3.8]. We prove the assertion for the case where $m = 2$. For the case where $m > 2$, the assertion is proved by changing notation.

Let X be a finite generating set of G relative to $\mathbb{K}$. We put $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{K\in\mathbb{K}} K\setminus\{1\}$ and $Y = X \cup \mathcal{K}$. By [25, Corollaries 1.7 and 4.5] and [2, Lemma 3.8], G contains subgroups $E_1, \ldots, E_6$ of G such that G is hyperbolic relative to $\mathbb{K}\cup\{E_1, \ldots, E_6\}$ and for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$, we have $E_i = \langle g_i\rangle \times K(G)$ for some element g_i of G. We put $\mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{6} E_i \setminus \{1\}$.

For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$, we denote by $\hat{d}_i$ the relative metric on E_i defined in [7, Definition 4.2] by using the Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, Y \cup \mathcal{E})$. We take a positive integer n such that for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$, we have $\hat{d}_i(1, g_i^n) > 50D$, where $D = D(1, 0)$ is given by [7, Proposition 4.14] applied to the Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, Y \cup \mathcal{E})$. We put $x = g_1^n g_2^n g_3^n$ and $y = g_4^n g_5^n g_6^n$. We denote by H the subgroup of G which is generated by $\{x, y\}$ and $K(G)$.

Since for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$, the subgroup $\langle g_i\rangle$ commutes with $K(G)$, we have $H = \langle x, y\rangle \times K(G)$. As mentioned in the proof of [7, Theorem 6.14 (c)], the subgroup $\langle x, y\rangle$ is a free group of rank two.

Let $r = r_1 \ldots r_k$ be a path in $\Gamma(G, Y \cup \mathcal{E})$ such that for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, the label of the edge r_j belongs to $\{(g_1^n g_2^n g_3^n)^{\pm1}, (g_4^n g_5^n g_6^n)^{\pm1}\}$. Here for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$, we think of g_i^n as a letter in $\mathcal{E}$. By [7, Lemma 4.20], the path r is a $(4, 1)$-quasigeodesic. Now we consider the metrics on $\langle x, y\rangle$, H and G induced by the Cayley graphs $\Gamma(\langle x, y\rangle, \{x, y\})$, $\Gamma(H, \{x, y\} \cup K(G))$ and $\Gamma(G, Y \cup \mathcal{E})$, respectively. Then the natural embedding from $\langle x, y\rangle$ into G is quasi-isometric. Since H contains $\langle x, y\rangle$ as a finite index subgroup, the natural embedding from H into G is also quasi-isometric.

By the proof of [7, Theorem 6.14 (c)], the subgroup H is hyperbolically embedded in G in the sense of [7]. Hence H is almost malnormal in G by [7, Proposition 2.8].

Therefore G is hyperbolic relative to $\mathbb{K}\cup\{E_1, \ldots, E_6\}\cup\{H\}$ by [25, Theorem 1.5]. Since for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$, the subgroup E_i is a hyperbolic group, the group G is hyperbolic relative to $\mathbb{K} \cup \{H\}$ by [24, Theorem 2.40]. □

References

[1] J. W. Anderson, J. Aramayona, and K. J. Shackleton, An obstruction to the strong relative hyperbolicity of a group, J. Group Theory 10 (2007), no. 6, 749-756.

[2] G. Arzhantseva, A. Minasyan and D. Osin, The SQ-universality and residual properties of relatively hyperbolic groups, J. Algebra 315 (2007), no. 1, 165–177.

[3] J. Behrstock, C. Druţu and L. Mosher, Thick metric spaces, relative hyperbolicity, and quasi-isometric rigidity, Math. Ann. 344 (2009), no. 3, 543–595.

[4] B. H. Bowditch, Convergence groups and configuration spaces, Geometric group theory down under (Canberra, 1996), 23–54, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.

[5] B. H. Bowditch, Relatively hyperbolic groups, Internat. J. Algebra. Comput. 22, no. 3 (2012).

[6] F. Dahmani, Combination of convergence groups, Geom. Topol. 7 (2003), 933–963.

[7] F. Dahmani, V. Guirardel and D. Osin, Hyperbolically embedded subgroups and rotating families in groups acting on hyperbolic spaces, preprint, arXiv:1111.7048v3.

[8] C. Druţu and M. Sapir, Tree-graded spaces and asymptotic cones of groups. With an appendix by D. Osin and M. Sapir, Topology 44 (2005), no. 5, 959–1058.

[9] B. Farb, Relatively hyperbolic groups, Geom. Funct. Anal. 8 (1998), no. 5, 810–840.

[10] W. J. Floyd, Group completions and limit sets of Kleinian groups, Invent. Math. 57 (1980), no. 3, 205–218.

[11] E. M. Freden, Negatively curved groups have the convergence property I, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. 20 (1995), no. 2, 333–348.

[12] F. W. Gehring and G. J. Martin, Discrete quasiconformal groups I, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 55 (1987), no. 2, 331–358.

[13] V. Gerasimov, Expansive convergence groups are relatively hyperbolic, Geom. Funct. Anal. 19 (2009), no. 1, 137–169.

[14] V. Gerasimov, Floyd maps for relatively hyperbolic groups, preprint, arXiv:1001.4482v3. To appear in GAFA.

[15] V. Gerasimov and L. Potyagail, Quasi-isometric maps and Floyd boundaries of relatively hyperbolic groups, preprint, arXiv:0908.0705v8. To appear in JEMS.

[16] M. Gromov, Hyperbolic groups, Essays in group theory (S. Gersten, ed.), 75–263, MSRI Publications 8, Springer-Verlag, 1987.

[17] Daniel Groves; Jason Fox Manning, Dehn filling in relatively hyperbolic groups. Israel J. Math. 168 (2008), 317–429.

[18] G. C. Hruska, Relative hyperbolicity and relative quasiconvexity for countable groups, Algebr. Geom. Topol. 10 (2010), no. 3, 1807–1856.

[19] A. Karlsson and G. A. Noskov, Some groups having only elementary actions on metric spaces with hyperbolic boundaries, Geom. Dedicata 104 (2004), 119–137.

[20] Y. Matsuda, S. Oguni and S. Yamagata, The universal relatively hyperbolic structure on a group and relative quasiconvexity for subgroups, preprint, arXiv:1106.5288v3.

[21] Y. Matsuda, S. Oguni and S. Yamagata, Hyperbolically embedded virtually free subgroups of relatively hyperbolic groups, preprint, arXiv:1109.2663v3.

[22] Mahan Mitra, Cannon-Thurston maps for trees of hyperbolic metric spaces. J. Differential Geom. 48 (1998), no. 1, 135–164.

[23] Mahan Mj, Cannon-Thurston maps for pared manifolds of bounded geometry. Geom. Topol. 13 (2009), no. 1, 189–245.

[24] D. Osin, Relatively hyperbolic groups: intrinsic geometry, algebraic properties, and algorithmic problems, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 179 (2006), no. 843

[25] D. Osin, Elementary subgroups of relatively hyperbolic groups and bounded generation, Internat. J. Algebra. Comput. 16, no. 1 (2006), 99–118.

[26] P. Tukia, A remark on a paper by Floyd, Holomorphic functions and moduli, Vol. II (Berkeley, CA, 1986), 165–172, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 11, Springer, New York, 1988.

[27] P. Tukia, Convergence groups and Gromov's metric hyperbolic spaces, New Zealand J. Math. 23 (1994), no. 2, 157–187.

[28] P. Tukia, Conical limit points and uniform convergence groups, J. Reine Angew. Math. 501 (1998), 71–98.

[29] A. Yaman, A topological characterisation of relatively hyperbolic groups, J. Reine Angew. Math. 566 (2004), 41–89.

[30] W. Yang, Limit sets of relatively hyperbolic groups, Geom. Dedicata 156 (2012), 1–12.

[31] W. Yang, Peripheral structures of relatively hyperbolic groups, preprint, arXiv:1101.2990v3.